

#### REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 2 and 4 have been amended to cancel the "narrower statement of the range/limitation", while new claims 9-14 present the narrower range/limitations cancelled from claims 2 and 4. In addition, the claims have been amended for clarity.

Applicant believes that the above changes answer the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 2, rejection of claims 2 and 4, and respectfully requests withdrawal thereof.

Applicant would like to note that the changes to claims 1, 3, 5 and 8 are editorial in nature only and do not affect the scope of the claims.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 and 6-8 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting and being unpatentable over claim 8 of U.S. Patent 6,944,337.

Enclosed herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer referencing U.S. Patent 6,944,337. As such, Applicant believes that the Examiner's obviousness-type double patenting rejection has been overcome.

Applicant believes that this application, containing claims 1-14, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/  
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613  
Attorney  
Tel.: 914-333-9611